

### **REMARKS**

Claims 18-42 are pending in this application, claims 1-17 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. The office action stated that claim 18 was rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The office action further states that it is not understood how substantially all of the compression takes place in the internal compression surfaces of applicant's invention when the inlet leading edges are staggered. Applicant has amended claim 18 to remove the limitation requiring that all of the compression take place internally. For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 19 was rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Karanian. The office action further stated that Karanian discloses a supersonic inlet with staggered leading edges. Claim 19 has been amended to state that one or more external surfaces of the inlet are substantially aligned with the airflow of the aircraft. The Karanian reference does not teach or disclose a supersonic inlet having one or more external surfaces that are substantially aligned with the airflow. For example, see figure 1 wherein the external surface denoted as 10 is curved and therefore not aligned with the airflow 12. For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1-8, 12-14, 16 and 17 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by, or in the alternative, under 25 USC 103 as obvious over Koncsek. These claims were canceled without prejudice or disclaimer to expedite prosecution of this case.


Claim 18 was rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Koncsek in view of Tindell. Amended claim 18 states that the supersonic inlet has one or more external surfaces that are substantially aligned with the airflow. As evident in figures 2-11, Koncsek's external surfaces of his inlet are not substantially aligned with the airflow. See also Col. 6, lines 28-33 which describes the cowl sidewalls as being at a very small angle with the direction of flight. Further, Tindell does not show or describe an inlet having external surfaces which are

substantially aligned with the airflow. For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

This application is now believed to be in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 10/20/2003

  
June Rickey, Reg. No. 40,144  
Calfee, Halter & Griswold LLP  
Customer No. 24024  
(216) 622-8543